



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,008	10/15/2003	Peter Weddeling	16104-011001/2003P0622 US	4880
32864 7590 03/19/2009 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/19/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/686,008	Applicant(s) WEDDELING ET AL.	
	Examiner NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) ☐ Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- A. This action is in response to the following communications: Request for Continued Examination filed 1/08/2009.
- B. Claims 1-20 remains pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/08/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-10, 14-15 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Petty et al (US 6,342,907 B1), herein referred to as "Petty".
-

As for independent claim 1, Petty teaches a method of converting a computer user interface panel between different panel types, the method comprising: identifying a first panel associated with a first computer system configured for displaying panels of a first type and not web-based panels (windows resource script type panels (col.7, lines 38-49); activating an automated process that reads field attributes in a first configuration table (1310; wherein 1310 depicts a structured document containing specific information for reproducing a panel; a table in comparison to 1310 yields the same predictable result of an organized data structure containing key information to the systems use) that can be used to display the first panel in the first computer system, the first panel comprising a plurality of fields and belonging to the first type of panels in which a configuration table associated with a panel of the first type is tied to logic that specifies how the panel of the first type interacts with a backend of the first computer system (col.7, lines 24-49); and creating entries in a second configuration table (1320 and 1330) that can be used to display a second panel in a second computer system configured for displaying panels of a second type that is web based (PDML, col.7, lines 24-49; java), the second panel comprising at least some of the plurality of fields and belonging to the second type of panels in which a panel of the second type is formed of configuration table entries and is independent of a backend of the second computer system; wherein the automated process converts the field attributes to be compatible with the second type of panels and stores them in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the second panel (col.21, lines 20-38).

As for dependent claim 2, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising associating the field attributes with fields of the second panel (col.21, lines 20-38).

As for dependent claim 3, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the field attributes that are read in the first configuration table are those field attributes of the first panel that are relevant for converting the first panel to the second panel (col.21, lines 20-38; first file is needed to output desired file).

As for dependent claim 4, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the plurality of fields comprises first and second template fields to be displayed next to each other on a common row in the first panel, wherein converting attributes associated with the first and second template fields comprises determining whether the second template field is an input field (col.10, line 49; PDML Tags- listed through columns 14-20 are various graphical user interface elements known as PDML Tags which make up the panel in the graphical user interface which is converted using the conversion tool).

As for dependent claim 5, Petty teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the second template field is not an input field, further comprising converting the attributes associated with the first and second template fields so that the first and second template fields will be displayed on a common row of the second panel (note the analysis of claim 4 above; mapping is handled by the conversion tool).

As for dependent claim 6, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the panels of the second type comprise columns in which the fields are arranged, and wherein the plurality of fields comprises first and second fields to be displayed next to each other on a common row in the first panel, wherein converting attributes associated with the first and second fields comprises determining whether the first and second fields are input fields (note the analysis of claim 1 above; the system determines that an element is (identifies the element in the structured data) and then converts).

As for dependent claim 7, Petty teaches the method of claim 6, wherein both the first and second fields are input fields, further comprising converting the attributes associated with the first and second fields so that the first and second fields will be displayed on a common row and in a common column of the second panel (note the analysis of claim 4 above; col.18).

As for dependent claim 8, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the panels of the second type comprise columns in which the fields are arranged and wherein each of the plurality of fields has a length specified as a number of characters, wherein converting the field attributes comprises assigning a specific width of at least one column to each of the fields based on its specified length (note the analysis of claim 4 above).

Art Unit: 2179

As for dependent claim 9, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first panel comprises a plurality of binary controls that can be individually selected by a user, and wherein panels of the first type having such binary controls comprise a Boolean variable for each of the binary controls, wherein attributes associated with the binary controls are converted so that one of the fields of the second panel represents the binary controls (col.3, lines 30-33; user does not need to know program specific language).

As for dependent claim 10, Petty teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving and executing a user input for editing the second pane (col.3, lines 25-33).

As for independent claim 14, Petty teaches a computer system for converting a user interface panel between different panel types, the system comprising: *a first configuration table for use by a first computer system to display a first panel comprising a plurality of fields and belonging to a first type of panels that is not web-based and in which a configuration table associated with a panel of the first type is tied to logic that specifies how the panel of the first type interacts with a backend of the first computer system, a plurality of field attributes being associated with the plurality of fields, the first computer system being configured for displaying panels of the first type and not web-based panels; a second configuration table for use by a second computer system to display a second panel comprising at least some of the plurality of fields and belonging to a second type of panels that is web-based and in which a panel of the second type is formed of configuration table entries and is independent of a backend of the second*

Art Unit: 2179

computer system; and a conversion module that converts at least some of the field attributes to be compatible with the second type of panels and stores them in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the second panel. (Note the analysis of claim 1, along with col.7, lines 23-37; figures 1 and 13).

As for dependent claim 15, Petty teaches the computer system of claim 14, wherein the conversion module is capable of receiving and executing a command for editing the second panel (col.3, lines 25-33).

As for independent claim 18, Petty teaches a computer program product tangibly embodied in a computer-readable storage device, the computer program product containing executable instructions that when executed cause a processor to perform operations comprising: identifying a first panel associated with a first computer system configured for displaying panels of a first type and not web-based panels; *activating an automated process that reads field attributes in a first configuration table that can be used to display the first panel in the first computer system, the first panel comprising a plurality of fields and belonging to the first type of panels that is not web-based and in which a configuration table associated with a panel of the first type is tied to logic that specifies how the panel of the first type interacts with a backend of the first computer system; and creating entries in a second configuration table that can be used to display a second panel in a second computer system configured for displaying panels of a*

Art Unit: 2179

second type that is web-based, the second panel comprising at least some of the plurality of fields and belonging to the second type of panels in which a panel of the second type is formed of configuration table entries and is independent of a backend of the second computer system; wherein the automated process converts the field attributes to be compatible with the second type of panels and stores them in the second configuration table for use by the second computer system in displaying the second panel. (Note the analysis of claim 1, along with col.7, lines 23-37; col.8, lines 35-59; figures 1 and 13).

As for dependent claim 19, Petty teaches the computer program product of claim 18, further comprising instructions that when executed cause the processor to perform operations comprising: receiving and executing a command for editing the second panel (col.3, lines 25-33).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions

Art Unit: 2179

covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 11-13, 16-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petty in view of DevDaily.com (<http://www.devdaily.com/java/edu/vc/vc010003/>).

As for dependent claim 11, Petty teaches the method of claim 10. Petty also teaches the use makes use of a graphical editor and mentions the use of Visual Café. Petty does not specifically go into details of how the graphical editor Visual Café works with user interaction, however in the same field of endeavor DevDaily.com teaches wherein the input is received and executed in a drag-and-drop environment (page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine DevDaily.com into Petty because DevDaily.com provide detailed user interaction with the system of Visual Cafe which was widely known in the art and for the fact that Petty mentions the use of Visual Cafe as a graphical editor for Petty's system of conversion (col.3, lines 5 and 30; Petty).

As for dependent claim 12, Petty teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the input changes a location of one of the fields of the second panel (note the analysis of claim

Art Unit: 2179

11 above).

As for dependent claim 13, Petty teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the input changes an attribute of one of the fields of the second panel (note the analysis of claim 11 above).

As for dependent claim 16, Petty teaches the computer system of claim 14, wherein the conversion module provides a drag-and-drop environment for receiving and executing the command (note the analysis of claim 11 above).

As for dependent claim 17, Petty teaches the computer system of claim 14, further comprising a drag-and-drop environment displayable on a screen by which a user can edit the second panel (note the analysis of claim 11 above).

As for dependent claim 20, Petty teaches the computer program product of claim 19, further comprising instructions that when executed cause the processor to perform operations comprising: presenting a drag-and-drop environment where a user can edit the second panel (note the analysis of claim 11 above).

(Note :) It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 01/08/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After careful review of the amended claims (given the broadest interpretation) and the remarks provided by the Applicant along with the cited reference(s) the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant for at least the reasons provided below:

A1. Applicant argues that Petty does not teach a first type of panel that belongs to the first computer system and is not web based..

R1. Examiner does not agree, Petty discloses a system for converting multiple panels to render a graphical user interface, multiple panels being platform specific. Wherein relating to the rejection of claim 1, the first type of panel is a "windows resource script". This belongs to the windows operating computing system. Further the windows resource script is non-web based, further it is converted to a second type of panel called PDML which is web based and is apart of a second computing system different from the first (language difference for example, different platform; e.g. java related).

A2. Applicant argues that Petty does not teach "a configuration table... is tied to logic that specifies how the panel of the first type interacts with a backend of the computer system" and the method includes the step of "activating an automated process that reads field attributes in a first configuration table..."

R2. Examiner does not agree, Petty does teach the same functionality of a configuration table as described in the claim language wherein 1310 depicts a structured document containing specific information for reproducing a panel that can be manipulated by the user or system; a table in comparison to 1310 yields the same predictable result of an organized data structure containing key information to the systems use. Further Petty discloses that the panel conversion tool which is associated with panels is tied to logic that specifies how a panel of a certain type (e.g. platform specific) interacts with the computer system in various ways. This system as described by Petty provides the author of an interface the ability to design any type of panel with any type of functionality as so known to those skilled in the art (col.7, lines 23-37), therefore it is apparent that a panel that is dependent of the backend of the computer system and another panel that is independent of the backend is achievable.

A3. Applicant argues that Petty does not disclose "field attributes" from the configuration table.

R3. Examiner does not agree Petty shows that entire panels with contents are converted; this includes field attributes which are compatible to the new definition (PDML).

In short, Examiner believes that Petty teaches the immediate claim language such that there exist an automated process that involves a panel from a platform specific logic that incorporates functionality methods of communicating to the backend of a computer system this is then processed to a conversion tool to format into PDML

Art Unit: 2179

language for display purposes of the user interface which does not have to deal with the backend of the computer system, its main purpose is to display correctly to the user while the first iteration deals with the backend of the computer (functionality to be carried out by control). Petty teaches that the system can convert windows resource script file type panels which are non web based into PDML type panels which are web based.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056 and fax is 571-270-2056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 9:30am- 5:00pm Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2179

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
March 12, 2009

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179